

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginsa 22313-1450 www.msplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/396,429	09/15/1999	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	SEDN/5815	7434	
56015 WALL & TON	7590 06/02/2009 NG. LLP/	EXAM	EXAMINER		
SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC			SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D		
595 SHREWS SUITE 100	BURY AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SHREWSBUF	RY, NJ 07702	2421			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/02/2009	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/396,429	HENDRICKS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
DOMINIC D. SALTARELLI	2421	

	DOMINIC D. SALTARELLI	2421				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 26 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 T CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 766.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	in.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period cat under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of thes set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b     (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor     (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov     (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better.	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);				
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
<ul> <li>4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</li> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>						
7. \( \subseteq  for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) [\ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	rided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13.  Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Dominic D Saltarelli/	nit 2421				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First, applicant argues that Banker fails to disclose placing the modern on the hardware upgrade, stating that Banker teaches the set top device already has a modern and that the expansion card provides additional memory or security (applicant's remarks, page 3).

In response, as highlighted by the examiner, the use of a telephone type module by Banker for interacting with an interactive service is optional (Banker, col. 7, lines 57-66). Further, the claimed feature of placing the modem on the hardware upgrade is a feature rendered obvious when Banker is modified in view of Hoarty.

Second, applicant argues Hoarty fails to disclose the modem connected to the expansion port adds data modulation and demodulation to the set top terminal for accessing an on-line database at a headend and retrieving interactive services from one or more headends (applicant's remarks, page 3).

In response, this feature of accessing remote headends for interactive services is disclosed by Palazzi,

Third, applicant argues Palazzi fails to disclose a modem capable of communicating with a headend.

In response, the examiner can only surmise that applicant is arguing against Palazzi because he does not refer to the remote databases accessed by his modern for retrieving interactive services specifically as "headends". This is merely an issue of semantics, since according to the claimed limitations, headends are remotely located systems accessible by modern which provide interactive services via an on-line database.